



S DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Patent and Trademark Office

COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231

J.R.

					0.101
APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE		FIRST NAMED INVENTOR			ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/194,112	11/23/98	ONUKI		М	229-532PCT
_ 002292		QM12/1222	コ	EXAMINER	
BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH				BLAU,S	
8110 GATEHOU				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SUITE 500 EA FALLS CHURCH				3711	#11
				DATE MAILED	: 12/22/00
					الباليا كسنفستان كستاد الد

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Advisory Action

Application No. 09/194,112

Applicant(s)

Onuki

Examiner

Stephen Blau

Group Art Unit 3711



THE PERIOD FOR RESPONSE: [check only a) or b)]	
a) X expires 4 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.	
b) expires either three months from the mailing date of the final rejection, or on the mailing date of this Advisory Action, which is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for the response expire later than six months from the date of the fin rejection.	ever nal
Any extension of time must be obtained by filing a petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a), the proposed response and the appropriate fee. date on which the response, the petition, and the fee have been filed is the date of the response and also the date for the purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. Any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.17 will be calculated from the date of the originally set shortened statutory period for response or as set forth in b) above.	The of
Appellant's Brief is due two months from the date of the Notice of Appeal filed on (or within a period for response set forth above, whichever is later). See 37 CFR 1.191(d) and 37 CFR 1.192(a).	any
Applicant's response to the final rejection, filed on <u>Dec 7, 2000</u> has been considered with the following effect out is NOT deemed to place the application in condition for allowance:	
The proposed amendment(s):	
will be entered upon filing of a Notice of Appeal and an Appeal Brief.	
Ithey raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search. (See note below).	
☐ they raise the issue of new matter. (See note below).	
they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying issues for appeal.	the
\square they present additional claims without cancelling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.	
NOTE: The face thickness requires further consideration and/or search.	
Applicable response has a consequently falled by the falle	
Applicant's response has overcome the following rejection(s):	
Applicant's response has overcome the following rejection(s):	a
Newly proposed or amended claims would be allowable if submitted in separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims. The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in cor for allowance because: The argument that it is improper to use the reference of Peker since though Peker discloses the relevant alloys it is	ndition
Newly proposed or amended claims would be allowable if submitted in separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims. The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in corfor allowance because:	ndition would
Newly proposed or amended claims would be allowable if submitted in separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims. The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in corfor allowance because: The argument that it is improper to use the reference of Peker since though Peker discloses the relevant alloys it is not be obvious to have the claimed properties is disagreed with. This properties are suitable for a golf club head. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly rais the Examiner in the final rejection.	ndition would
Newly proposed or amended claims would be allowable if submitted in separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims. The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in corfor allowance because: The argument that it is improper to use the reference of Peker since though Peker discloses the relevant alloys it is not be obvious to have the claimed properties is disagreed with. This properties are suitable for a golf club head. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly rais the Examiner in the final rejection. For purposes of Appeal, the status of the claims is as follows (see attached written explanation, if any):	ndition would
Newly proposed or amended claims would be allowable if submitted in separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims. The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in corfor allowance because: The argument that it is improper to use the reference of Peker since though Peker discloses the relevant alloys it is not be obvious to have the claimed properties is disagreed with. This properties are suitable for a golf club head. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly rais the Examiner in the final rejection.	ndition would
Newly proposed or amended claims would be allowable if submitted in separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims. The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in corfor allowance because: The argument that it is improper to use the reference of Peker since though Peker discloses the relevant alloys it is not be obvious to have the claimed properties is disagreed with. This properties are suitable for a golf club head. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly rais the Examiner in the final rejection. For purposes of Appeal, the status of the claims is as follows (see attached written explanation, if any): Claims allowed: As stated in the Final Office Action.	ndition would
Newly proposed or amended claims would be allowable if submitted in separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims. The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in cor for allowance because: The argument that it is improper to use the reference of Peker since though Peker discloses the relevant alloys it is not be obvious to have the claimed properties is disagreed with. This properties are suitable for a golf club head. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly rais the Examiner in the final rejection. For purposes of Appeal, the status of the claims is as follows (see attached written explanation, if any): Claims allowed: As stated in the Final Office Action. Claims objected to: As stated in the Final Office Action.	would red by
Newly proposed or amended claims	would red by
Newly proposed or amended claims would be allowable if submitted in separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims. The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in corfor allowance because: The argument that it is improper to use the reference of Peker since though Peker discloses the relevant alloys it into the obvious to have the claimed properties is disagreed with. This properties are suitable for a golf club head. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly rais the Examiner in the final rejection. For purposes of Appeal, the status of the claims is as follows (see attached written explanation, if any): Claims allowed: As stated in the Final Office Action. Claims objected to: As stated in the Final Office Action. Claims rejected: As stated in the Final Office Action. The proposed drawing correction filed on	would red by
Newly proposed or amended claims separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims. The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in corfor allowance because: The argument that it is improper to use the reference of Peker since though Peker discloses the relevant alloys it is not be obvious to have the claimed properties is disagreed with. This properties are suitable for a golf club head. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly rais the Examiner in the final rejection. For purposes of Appeal, the status of the claims is as follows (see attached written explanation, if any): Claims allowed: As stated in the Final Office Action. Claims objected to: As stated in the Final Office Action. Claims rejected: As stated in the Final Office Action. The proposed drawing correction filed on	would red by